PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   **10004559-1**

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s):   Robert E. Johnson et al.   Confirmation No.: 3219

Application No.: 09/845,839   Examiner: J. Bullock

Filing Date: April 30, 2001   Group Art Unit: 2162

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VALIDATION OF STORAGE DEVICE ADDRESSES

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on ___3/10/2008___.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief was previously filed January 20, 2006.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐(a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month $120	☐ 2nd Month $450	☐ 3rd Month $1020	☐ 4th Month $1590

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒(b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Johnson et al.

By:

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via eletronic filing.

/Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Date of Transmission: March 10, 2008

Reg No. : 44,034

Date :   March 10, 2008

Telephone : 214-855-8007

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Docket No.: 10004559-1
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Robert E. Johnson et al.

Application No.: 09/845,839   Confirmation No.: 3219

Filed: April 30, 2001   Art Unit: 2162

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VALIDATION   Examiner: J. Bullock
      OF STORAGE DEVICE ADDRESSES

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

      As required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the
Notice of Appeal filed herewith, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

      No fees are believed to be due for the Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief, as fees were
previously paid for an earlier Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief and in response to which the
Examiner reopened prosecution (e.g., in the Office Action mailed July 27, 2007.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P., a Texas Limited Partnership having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas.

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III.   STATUS OF CLAIMS

A.   Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 30 claims pending in application.

B.   Current Status of Claims

1.   Claims canceled: 0

2.   Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: 0

3.   Claims pending: 1-30

4.   Claims allowed: 0

5.   Claims rejected: 1-30

C.   Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-30

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A Final Office Action rejecting the claims of the present application was mailed January 11, 2008. In response, Applicant did not file an Amendment After Final, but instead filed a Notice of Appeal, which this brief supports. Accordingly, the claims on appeal are those as rejected in the Final Office Action of January 11, 2008. A complete listing of the claims is provided in the Claims Appendix hereto.

V.   SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in the independent claim involved in the appeal, referring to the Specification by page and line number and to the Drawings by reference characters, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37. As such, each element of the claims is identified by a corresponding reference to the Specification and Drawings, where applicable. However, citation to passages in the Specification and Drawings does not imply that limitations from the Specification and Drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element.

According to one claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 1, a method comprises storing discovery information relating to a storage device (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 14, ln. 19—p. 16, ln. 2; Fig. 7, items 701 and 702), querying the storage device for device identification information (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 16, lns. 3-15; Fig. 7, item 703), and comparing at least a portion of returned device identification information to at least a portion of the stored discovery information (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 17, lns. 1-6; Fig. 7, item 705).

In certain embodiments, such as that of dependent claim 9, the stored discovery information includes device address information, wherein said device address information includes claimed address information (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 15, lines 1-26; Fig. 7, item 702); and wherein said method further comprises determining claimed address information for said storage device (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 15, lines 1-26; Fig. 7, items 701 and 702); and comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 17, lines 1-6).

In certain embodiments, such as that of dependent claim 11, the stored discovery information further includes serial number information for said storage device (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 12, line 28 – page 13, line 21), and wherein said method further comprises: querying said storage device for serial number information for said device (*see e.g.*, Specification at p. 16, lines 3-15); and comparing said serial number information received in response to said

serial number information query to said stored serial number information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 17, lines 1-6).

In certain embodiments, such as that of dependent claim 16, the storing discovery information includes storing discovery information on a host system and a storage management system (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 11, lines 6-17); and wherein said deleting or updating said stored discovery information includes deleting or updating said discovery information stored at said host system and at said storage management system (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 14, lines 1-10).

According to another claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 21, a system comprises means for storing discovery information for a storage device (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 14, ln. 19—p. 16, ln. 2; Fig. 7, items 701 and 702), means for querying the storage device for device identification information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 16, lns. 3-15; Fig. 7, item 703), and means for comparing at least a portion of device identification information received in response to the query to at least a portion of the stored discovery information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 17, lns. 1-6; Fig. 7, item 705).

In certain embodiments, such as that of dependent claim 23, the discovery information includes device address information, wherein said device address information includes claimed address information for said storage device (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 15, lines 1-26; Fig. 7, item 702); and wherein said system further comprises: means for determining claimed address information for said device (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 15, lines 1-26; Fig. 7, items 701 and 702); means for comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 17, lines 1-6); and means for flagging said stored discovery information if said determined claimed address information does not match said stored claimed address information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 18, lines 12-22).

In certain embodiments, such as that of dependent claim 24, the discovery information further includes serial number information for said storage device (*see e.g.,* Specification at p.

12, line 28 – page 13, line 21), and wherein said system further comprises: means for querying said storage device for serial number information for said storage device (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 16, lines 3-15); means for comparing said serial number information received in response to said serial number information query to said stored serial number information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 17, lines 1-6); and means for flagging said stored discovery information if said received serial number information does not match said stored serial number information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 18, lines 12-22).

According to yet another embodiment, such as that of independent claim 29, a system comprises at least one host system, wherein at least one storage device is embedded in or coupled to each of the at least one host system (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 6, lns. 1-15; Fig. 1, items 101-1 and 102-1) and wherein each of the at least one host system stores information relating to the at least one storage device embedded in or coupled thereto (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 14, ln. 19----p. 16, ln. 2; Fig. 7, items 701 and 702), and at least one host agent process, wherein each of the at least one host agent process resides on a respective host system of the at least one host system (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 6, lns. 1-15; Fig. 1, item 106-1) and wherein each of the at least one host agent process is operable to query the at least one storage device embedded in or coupled to the host system on which the host agent process resides for device identification information (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 16, lns. 3-15; Fig. 7, item 703), as well as to compare information returned by the at least one storage device to at least a portion of discovery information stored for the at least one storage device at the host system to which the at least one storage device is coupled (*see e.g.,* Specification at p. 17, lns. 1-6; Fig. 7, item 705).

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,263,445 to Blumenau (hereinafter "*Blumenau*").

VII.   ARGUMENT

Appellant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections of the pending claims, and requests that the Board reverse the outstanding rejections in light of the remarks contained herein. The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellant presents separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. Each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-heading as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

A. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 over *Blumenau*

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Blumenau*. Appellant traverses the rejection for the reasons stated below.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single reference must teach every element of the claim, *see* M.P.E.P. § 2131. Thus, § 102 anticipation is not found when the applied art is lacking or missing a specific feature or the structure of the claimed invention. Further, the Federal Circuit has explained: "There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As discussed further below, claims 1-30 are not anticipated under § 102 by *Blumenau* because *Blumenau* fails to teach each and every element of these claims as required by M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Independent Claim 1

Blumenau fails to teach all elements of independent claim 1 for the below reasons.

1. Blumenau does not disclose storing discovery information relating to a storage device

Independent claim 1 recites "storing discovery information ***relating to a storage device***" (emphasis added). *Blumenau* fails to teach this element of claim 1 because the information

discovered in *Blumenau* is associated with its host devices, and not with its storage system, as discussed further below.

From the outset, Appellant notes that *Blumenau* discloses a method for authenticating connections between multiple host processors and a shared storage system in order to protect the storage system from unprivileged accesses. *See Blumenau* at title and abstract. According to *Blumenau*, "[o]ne problem with coupling multiple hosts to a shared storage system is [that b]ecause multiple hosts have access to a common storage system, each host may physically be able to access information that may be proprietary to the other host processors." *Id.* at col. 1, lns. 35-40. As such, *Blumenau*'s method provides for a verification, "at the storage system, that each request in a series of requests for access to the storage system indicated as having been issued by the device was actually issued by the device." *Id.* at col. 1, lns. 54-57. Thus, while *Blumenau* may be concerned with discovering information related to devices that have access to a shared storage system, it is not concerned with the discovery information associated with the storage system itself.

In fact, Appellant points out that *Blumenau* makes a clear distinction between "devices" and "storage systems":

> [t]he present invention is directed to a data management method and apparatus for managing accesses by multiple ***devices (e.g., host processors, file servers and the like)*** to data at a ***shared resource (e.g., a shared storage system)***.

Blumenau at col. 3, lns. 12-16 (emphasis added). Further, the very passage of *Blumenau* cited by the Examiner states that "as each device enters the network, it queries the network to identify the other devices coupled to the network . . . [t]he source identifier may identify the ***device (e.g., a host processor)*** and the port of the device that is coupled to the network." *Id.* at col. 4, ln. 62—col. 5, ln. 6 (emphasis added). At the most, this passage discloses discovering information about host processors, file servers, etc. that have access to a storage system, but it does not teach discovering information about the storage system itself.

Moreover, the paragraph immediately preceding the above passage of *Blumenau* states that "the data management aspect of the present invention configures volumes of data at the storage system 20 according to the ***identity of the host devices coupled to the storage system*** . . . [and that a]s a new host device enters the network, the system administrator allocates storage system volumes to the host." *Id.* at col. 4, lns. 42-53. This passage further supports Appellant's position that discovery information in *Blumenau* is associated with its host devices, and not with its storage system.

2. Blumenau does not disclose querying a storage device for device identification information

Additionally, independent claim 1 further recites "querying said storage device for device identification information." *Blumenau* further fails to teach this element of claim 1, as discussed below.

The passage of *Blumenau* relied upon by the Examiner as meeting the above element of claim 1 states that "as each device enters the network, it queries the network to identify the other devices coupled to the network . . . [t]he source identifier may ***identify the device (e.g., a host processor)*** and the port of the device that is coupled to the network." *Blumenau* at col. 4, ln. 62—col. 5, ln. 6 (emphasis added).

As previously noted, *Blumenau* makes a clear distinction between "devices," which may be "host processors, file servers and the like," and "shared storage systems." *Id.* at col. 3, lns. 12-16. Therefore, while, *Blumenau* may disclose querying its host processors, file servers, etc. for identification information, it does not disclose querying a storage device for identification information, as recited in claim 1.

3. Blumenau does not disclose comparing at least a portion of returned device identification information to at least a portion of said stored discovery information

Independent claim 1 additionally recites "comparing at least a portion of returned device identification information to at least a portion of said stored discovery information." *Blumenau* further fails to teach this element of claim 1, as discussed below.

The passage of *Blumenau* relied upon by the Examiner as meeting the above element of claim 1 states, in relevant part, that "[t]he address is compared with the entry in the transient filter table 84 which includes the LUN map aassociated [sic] with the HBA." *Blumenau* at col. 8, lns. 10-21.

However, *Blumenau*'s "HBA" is a host bus adapter of its host processor. *Id.* at col. 6, lns. 25-41; figure 3, items 12 and 45. Therefore, while *Blumenau* may disclose comparing a host processor's identification information with information stored in a table, it does not teach comparing returned storage device identification information with stored discovery information relating to the storage device, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over *Blumenau* is improper because *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of claim 1. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests that the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 be overturned.

Dependent Claim 9

Dependent claim 9 depends indirectly from claim 1 and thus inherits all elements of claim 1. The rejection of claim 9 should thus be overturned for at least the reasons discussed above with claim 1.

Claim 8 recites "wherein said stored discovery information includes device address information", and claim 9 depends from claim 8 and further recites "wherein said device address information includes claimed address information; and wherein said method further comprises: determining claimed address information for said storage device; and comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information."

As discussed above with claim 1, *Blumenau* fails to teach storing discovery information relating to a storage device, and *Blumenau* further fails to teach storing such discovery information that includes claimed address information, as recited by claim 9.

In addition, as discussed above with claim 1 *Blumenau* fails to teach comparing returned storage device identification information with stored discovery information relating to the storage device. *Blumenau* further fails to teach comparing determined claimed address information to stored claimed address information, as recited by claim 9.

Thus, *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of dependent claim 9, and the rejection should therefore be overturned for these further reasons.

Dependent Claim 11

Dependent claim 11 depends from claim 9, which depends indirectly from claim 1, and thus claim 11 inherits all elements of claims 1 and 9. The rejection of claim 11 should thus be overturned for at least the reasons discussed above with claims 1 and 9.

Claim 11 further recites:

> The method of claim 9 wherein said stored discovery information further includes serial number information for said storage device, and wherein said method further comprises:
> querying said storage device for serial number information for said device; and
> comparing said serial number information received in response to said serial number information query to said stored serial number information.

Blumenau fails to teach querying its storage device for its serial number information, and comparing the serial number information of the storage device with stored serial number information, as recited by claim 11. Thus, *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of dependent claim 11, and the rejection should therefore be overturned for these further reasons.

Dependent Claim 16

Dependent claim 16 depends indirectly from claim 1, and thus claim 16 inherits all elements of claim 1. The rejection of claim 16 should thus be overturned for at least the reasons discussed above with claim 1.

Claim 16 further recites "wherein said storing discovery information includes storing discovery information on a host system and a storage management system; and wherein said deleting or updating said stored discovery information includes deleting or updating said discovery information stored at said host system and at said storage management system."

Blumenau appears to fail to teach such storing and deleting or updating of discovery information on both a host system and a storage management system. For instance, it appears that no such discovery information is stored, deleted or updated on the host system of *Blumenau*. Thus, *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of dependent claim 16, and the rejection should therefore be overturned for these further reasons.

Independent Claim 21

Blumenau fails to teach all elements of independent claim 21 for the below reasons.

1. Blumenau does not disclose storing discovery information relating to a storage device

Independent claim 21 recites "means for storing discovery information ***for a storage device***" (emphasis added). *Blumenau* fails to teach this element of claim 21 because the information discovered in *Blumenau* is information for its host devices, and not for its storage device, as discussed in detail above with claim 1.

2. Blumenau does not disclose querying a storage device for device identification information

Additionally, independent claim 21 further recites "means for querying said storage device for device identification information". *Blumenau* further fails to teach this element of claim 21. As discussed above with claim 1, while *Blumenau* may disclose querying its host processors, file servers, etc. for identification information, it <u>does not disclose querying a storage device for identification information</u>, as recited in claim 21.

3. <u>Blumenau does not disclose comparing at least a portion of returned device identification information to at least a portion of said stored discovery information</u>

Independent claim 21 additionally recites "means for comparing at least a portion of device identification information received in response to said query to at least a portion of said stored discovery information". *Blumenau* further fails to teach this element of claim 21. As discussed above with claim 1, while *Blumenau* may disclose comparing a host processor's identification information with information stored in a table, <u>it does not teach comparing returned storage device identification information with stored discovery information relating to the storage device</u>, as recited in claim 21.

In view of the above, Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over *Blumenau* is improper because *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of claim 21. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests that the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 21 be overturned.

Dependent Claim 23

Dependent claim 23 depends indirectly from claim 21 and thus inherits all elements of claim 21. The rejection of claim 23 should thus be overturned for at least the reasons discussed above with claim 21.

Claim 22 recites "wherein said stored discovery information includes device address information", and claim 23 depends from claim 22 and further recites "wherein said device address information includes claimed address information for said storage device; and wherein

said system further comprises: means for determining claimed address information for said device; means for comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information; and means for flagging said stored discovery information if said determined claimed address information does not match said stored claimed address information."

As discussed above with claims 1 and 21, *Blumenau* fails to teach storing discovery information relating to a storage device, and *Blumenau* further fails to teach storing such discovery information that includes claimed address information, as recited by claim 23.

In addition, as discussed above with claims 1 and 21 *Blumenau* fails to teach comparing returned storage device identification information with stored discovery information relating to the storage device. *Blumenau* further fails to teach "means for comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information," as recited by claim 23.

Thus, *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of dependent claim 23, and the rejection should therefore be overturned for these further reasons.

Dependent Claim 24

Dependent claim 24 depends from claim 23, which depends indirectly from claim 21, and thus claim 24 inherits all elements of claims 21 and 23. The rejection of claim 24 should thus be overturned for at least the reasons discussed above with claims 21 and 23.

Claim 24 further recites:

> The system of claim 23 wherein said discovery information further includes serial number information for said storage device, and wherein said system further comprises:
> means for querying said storage device for serial number information for said storage device;
> means for comparing said serial number information received in response to said serial number information query to said stored serial number information; and
> means for flagging said stored discovery information if said received serial number information does not match said stored serial number information.

Blumenau fails to teach means for querying its storage device for its serial number information, and means for comparing the serial number information of the storage device with stored serial number information, as recited by claim 24. Thus, *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of dependent claim 24, and the rejection should therefore be overturned for these further reasons.

Independent Claim 29

Blumenau fails to teach all elements of independent claim 29 for the below reasons.

1. Blumenau does not disclose storing discovery information relating to a storage device

Independent claim 29 recites "at least one host system [that] stores information ***relating to said at least one storage device*** embedded in or coupled thereto" (emphasis added). *Blumenau* fails to teach this element of claim 29 because the information stored in *Blumenau* is information relating to its host devices, and not information relating to an embedded or coupled storage device, as discussed in detail above with claim 1.

2. Blumenau does not disclose querying a storage device for device identification information

Additionally, independent claim 29 further recites "at least one host agent process [] operable to query said at least one storage device embedded in or coupled to said host system on which said host agent process resides for device identification information." *Blumenau* further fails to teach this element of claim 29. As discussed above with claim 1, while *Blumenau* may disclose querying its host processors, file servers, etc. for identification information, it does not disclose querying a storage device for identification information, as recited in claim 29.

3. Blumenau does not disclose comparing at least a portion of returned device identification information to at least a portion of said stored discovery information

Independent claim 29 additionally recites "host agent process [] operable to . . . compare information returned by said at least one storage device to at least a portion of discovery information stored for said at least one storage device." *Blumenau* further fails to teach this element of claim 29. As discussed above with claim 1, while *Blumenau* may disclose comparing a host processor's identification information with information stored in a table, it does not teach

comparing returned storage device identification information with discovery information stored for a storage device, as recited in claim 29.

In view of the above, Appellant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over *Blumenau* is improper because *Blumenau* fails to teach all elements of claim 29. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests that the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 29 be overturned.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Appellant requests that the board overturn the outstanding rejections of claims 1-30. Attached hereto are a Claims Appendix, Evidence Appendix, and Related Proceedings Appendix. As noted in the attached Evidence Appendix, no evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted. Also, no related appeals are identified in Section II above, and thus as noted by the Related Proceedings Appendix, no decisions in any such related proceedings are provided.

Respectfully submitted,

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: March 10, 2008

Signature: *Donna Forbit*
(Donna Forbit)

By _____
Jody C. Bishop
Registration No.: 44,034
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Date: March 10, 2008
Telephone: (214) 855-8007

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/845,839

1.   A method comprising:

storing discovery information relating to a storage device;

querying said storage device for device identification information; and

comparing at least a portion of returned device identification information to at least a portion of said stored discovery information.

2.   The method of claim 1 wherein said at least a portion of said stored discovery information includes device and host bus adapter information.

3.   The method of claim 1 wherein said stored discovery information is obtained through at least one small computer system interface (SCSI) inquiry.

4.   The method of claim 2 wherein said stored discovery information is obtained through at least one element selected from the group consisting of:

at least one system file;

at least one system registry; and

combinations thereof.

5.   The method of claim 2 wherein said stored discovery information is obtained through at least one element selected from the group consisting of:

operating system kernel application programming interface call;

host bus adapter device driver library application programming interface; and

some combination thereof.

6.   The method of claim 1 wherein said at least a portion of said returned device identification information includes Product ID, Vendor ID, and Product Revision information.

7.   The method of claim 1 wherein said returned device identification information includes standard device inquiry information.

8.   The method of claim 1 wherein said stored discovery information includes device address information.

9.   The method of claim 8 wherein said device address information includes claimed address information; and wherein said method further comprises:

determining claimed address information for said storage device; and

comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information.

10.   The method of claim 9 wherein said method further comprises:

flagging said stored discovery information if said determined claimed address information does not match said stored claimed address information.

11.   The method of claim 9 wherein said stored discovery information further includes serial number information for said storage device, and wherein said method further comprises:

querying said storage device for serial number information for said device; and

comparing said serial number information received in response to said serial number information query to said stored serial number information.

12.   The method of claim 9 wherein said method further comprises:

querying said storage device for serial number information for said device; and

accepting said stored device address information as valid if an error is returned in response to said query.

13.   The method of claim 1 wherein said querying includes at least one small computer system interface (SCSI) inquiry.

14.   The method of claim 1 wherein said method further includes flagging said stored discovery information if said at least a portion of said returned information does not match said at least a portion of said stored discovery information.

15.   The method of claim 14 wherein said method further comprises:

deleting or updating said stored discovery information if said stored discovery information is flagged.

16.   The method of claim 15 wherein said storing discovery information includes storing discovery information on a host system and a storage management system; and wherein said deleting or updating said stored discovery information includes deleting or updating said discovery information stored at said host system and at said storage management system.

17.   The method of claim 16 wherein said deleting or updating said stored discovery information stored at said host system further comprises:

transmitting an event to said storage managements system requesting said storage management system to delete or update said discovery information stored at said storage management system.

18.   The method of claim 15 wherein said method further comprises:

storing said returned information as a new device.

19.   The method of claim 18 wherein said method further comprises:

communicating an event requesting the addition of said returned information or an update of previous information using said returned information.

20.   The method of claim 18 wherein said method further comprises:

preventing communication between a storage management system and said device during said storing said returned information as a new device.

21.   A system comprising:

means for storing discovery information for a storage device;

means for querying said storage device for device identification information; and

means for comparing at least a portion of device identification information received in response to said query to at least a portion of said stored discovery information.

22.   The system of claim 21 wherein said discovery information includes device address information.

23.   The system of claim 22 wherein said device address information includes claimed address information for said storage device; and wherein said system further comprises:

means for determining claimed address information for said device;

means for comparing said determined claimed address information to said stored claimed address information; and

means for flagging said stored discovery information if said determined claimed address information does not match said stored claimed address information.

24.   The system of claim 23 wherein said discovery information further includes serial number information for said storage device, and wherein said system further comprises:

means for querying said storage device for serial number information for said storage device;

means for comparing said serial number information received in response to said serial number information query to said stored serial number information; and

means for flagging said stored discovery information if said received serial number information does not match said stored serial number information.

25.   The system of claim 23 wherein said system further comprises:

means for querying said storage device for serial number information for said device; and

means for accepting said stored device address information as valid if an error is returned in response to said query for serial number information.

26.   The system of claim 21 wherein said system further comprises:

means for flagging said stored discovery information if said at least a portion of said received information does not match said at least a portion of said stored discovery information.

27.   The system of claim 26 wherein said system further comprises:

means for deleting or updating said stored discovery information if said stored discovery information is flagged.

28.   The system of claim 27 wherein said system further comprises:

means for preventing communication between a storage management system and said storage device when said stored discovery information is being deleted or updated.

29.   A system comprising:

at least one host system, wherein at least one storage device is embedded in or coupled to each of said at least one host system; and wherein each of said at least one host system stores information relating to said at least one storage device embedded in or coupled thereto; and

at least one host agent process, wherein each of said at least one host agent process resides on a respective host system of said at least one host system;

wherein each of said at least one host agent process is operable to query said at least one storage device embedded in or coupled to said host system on which said host agent process resides for device identification information, as well as to compare information returned by said at least one storage device to at least a portion of discovery information stored for said at least one storage device at said host system to which said at least one storage device is coupled.

30.   The system of claim 29 wherein said at least one host agent process queries said at least one storage device during system start up or doing a discovery polling period.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.